

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
VICTORIA DIVISION

RICHARD P. MEITZLER,  
§  
§  
Plaintiff,  
§  
§  
v.  
§  
§  
HILDA COULTIER, *et al.*,  
§  
§  
Defendants.  
§

CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:24-CV-00032

United States District Court  
Southern District of Texas

**ORDER ADOPTING MEMORANDUM & RECOMMENDATION** **ENTERED**

December 10, 2024

Before the Court is Magistrate Judge Mitchel Neurock's Memorandum, Clerk

Recommendation ("M&R"). (D.E. 16). The M&R recommends that the Court dismiss Plaintiff's action without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and deny as moot all other motions.

*Id.* at 1.

The parties were provided proper notice of, and the opportunity to object to, the Magistrate Judge's M&R. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b); General Order No. 2002-13. No objection has been filed. When no timely objection has been filed, the district court need only determine whether the Magistrate Judge's M&R is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989) (per curiam); *Powell v. Litton Loan Servicing, L.P.*, No. 4:14-CV-02700, 2015 WL 3823141, at \*1 (S.D. Tex. June 18, 2015) (Harmon, J.) (citation omitted).

Having reviewed the proposed findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge, the filings of the parties, the record, and the applicable law, and finding that the M&R is not clearly erroneous or contrary to law, the Court **ADOPTS** the M&R in its entirety. (D.E. 16). Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES** Plaintiff's action without prejudice for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and

**DENIES** as moot all other motions filed in this case. (D.E. 3; D.E. 4; D.E. 5; D.E. 6).

SO ORDERED.



DAVID S. MORALES  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Signed: Corpus Christi, Texas  
December 10, 2024